

**Remarks**

The attention of the Office is called to an error in the Title of Invention in the *Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt* dated 24 August 2010. The correct title of the invention is as set forth above. The Office is requested to correct its records.

Claim 27 has been rejected for failure to comply with the sixth paragraph of 35 USC 112. The Applicant sets forth below the basis in the instant Specification for the recitations in Claim 27:

27. A mobile device for exchanging information with a communications network, comprising:

means for establishing a radio connection between said mobile device and said communications network (page 18, lines 25-26);

means for receiving by said mobile device authentication from said communications network (page 18, lines 26-27);

means for receiving by said mobile device a signaling request including parameters from said communications network for establishing a signaling connection tunnel (page 18, lines 26-29);

means for forwarding by said mobile device to said communications network acknowledgment of receipt of said parameters and an indication to said communications network that said tunnel has been established (page 18, line 30 to page 19, line 1);

means for receiving by said mobile device an indication from said communications network of completion of authorization to communicate with said communications network through an access point (page 19, lines 30-32);

means for closing said radio connection by said mobile device (page 20, lines 1-5); and

means for opening a connection through said established tunnel  
(page 20, lines 5-6).

The Applicant therefore submits that Claim 27 fully complies with  
USC 112.

This invention relates to a method and mobile device for  
establishing a signaling connection between a client and a  
communications network, so as to accomplish tight coupling  
therebetween. Once the signaling connection is established, there is no  
longer any need for an authentication connection. The authentication  
connection is closed.

Independent Claims 1, 18, 21 and 27 have been rejected under 35  
USC 103(a) as unpatentable over US 2002/0157019 to Kadyk et al in view  
of US 6,151,628 to Xu et al. Nowhere does either Kadyk et al or Xu et al  
show or suggest:

“transmitting set-up parameters from the communications network  
to the client terminal, the set-up parameters including information for  
establishing a signaling connection tunnel between the client terminal  
and the communications network for transferring control data;

establishing the control data signaling connection tunnel using the  
set-up parameters;

transmitting signaling information between the client terminal and  
the communications network via the control data signal connection  
tunnel; and

closing the authentication connection”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 1. Kadyk et al discloses a  
data tunnel between a client and a proxy. However, nowhere does Kadyk  
et al show or suggest any control data signaling tunnel, nor any closing of  
an authentication connection. Rather, Kadyk et al uses their tunnel for

data communication, and fails to close their authentication connection.

Similarly, nowhere does Xu et al show or suggest any control data signaling tunnel, nor any closing of their authentication connection. It is therefore clear that Kadyk et al and Xu et al, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Similarly, nowhere do Kadyk et al and Xu et al show or suggest:

“at said client terminal, receiving an authentication message from said communication network, said authentication message including set-up parameters defining a control data signaling connection tunnel between said client terminal and said communications network;

from said client terminal, setting up said control data signaling connection tunnel by use of said set-up parameters;

transmitting control information between said client terminal and said communications network via said control data signaling connection tunnel; and

closing said authentication connection”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 18. Rather, as explained above, nowhere does Kadyk et al show or suggest any control data signaling tunnel, nor any closing of an authentication connection. Rather, Kadyk et al uses their tunnel for data communication, and fails to close their authentication connection.

Similarly, nowhere does Xu et al show or suggest any control data signaling tunnel, nor any closing of their authentication connection. It is therefore clear that Kadyk et al and Xu et al, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of independent Claim 18. It is therefore clear that neither Kadyk et al nor Xu et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 18.

Similarly, nowhere does either Kadyk et al nor Xu et al show or suggest:

“terminating receipt of said authentication by said mobile device;  
and  
opening a signaling connection through said established tunnel”,

as specifically set forth in independent Claim 21. Rather, as explained above, neither Kadyk et al nor Xu et al establish a signaling tunnel and close an authentication connection. It is therefore clear that neither Kadyk et al nor Xu et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 21.

Similarly, nowhere does either Kadyk et al or Xu et al show or suggest:

“means for closing said radio connection by said mobile device; and  
means for opening a signaling connection through said established  
tunnel”,

as specifically recited in independent Claim 27 as amended. Rather, as explained above, neither Kadyk et al nor Xu et al establish a signaling tunnel and close an authentication connection. It is therefore clear that neither Kadyk et al nor Xu et al affect the patentability of independent Claim 27.

The Examiner has additionally applied US 2004/0066769 to Ahmavaara et al, to subclaims 5-7, 9 and 23-26. However, since nowhere does Ahmavaara et al establish a signaling tunnel and close an authentication connection, as set forth in their parent Claims 1 and 21, the applicant submits that Ahmavaara et al does not affect the patentability of subclaims 5-7, 9 and 23-26.

The Examiner has additionally applied US 2004/0054794 to Lantto et al to subclaim 8. However, since nowhere does Lantto et al establish a signaling tunnel and close an authentication connection, as set forth in parent Claim 1, Lantto et al does not affect the patentability of subclaim 8.

The Examiner has additionally cited, but not applied, US 2003/0226017 to Palekar et al. The Applicant has reviewed this reference and believes that it is no more relevant to the instant invention than the references which have been applied.

Claims 2-4 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claims 19 and 20 are dependent from Claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

Claim 22 is dependent from Claim 21 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 21.

The Applicant therefore submits that Claims 1-9 and 18-27 are now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Guillaume Bichot

/Catherine A. Cooper/

By: Catherine A. Cooper  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,877  
609/734-6440

THOMSON Licensing LLC  
Patent Operation  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: March 4, 2011\_\_